

Appln No. 10/713,091
Amdt. Dated 24 January 2005
Response to Office Action of 16th November 2004

3

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant has fully considered the Office Action and the Examiner's detailed comments but respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion that the claims fail to comply with 35 USC 112.

Claims 1 – 17 presently rejected are original claims in the present application. The Examiner would be well aware that it is well established that a satisfactory written description of the invention may be in the claims themselves or any other portion of the originally filed specification (*In re Koller*, 613 F.2d 819, 204, USPQ 702 (CCPA 1980)).

It is submitted that the Applicant has shown possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations, which satisfies the written description of the invention requirement of 35 USC 112.

The Applicant submits the following comments for the Examiner's consideration and respectfully again reminds the Examiner of the strong presumption that an adequate written description of the claimed invention is present when the application is filed (*In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 263, 191 USPQ 90, 97 (CCPA 1976)).

The Examiner asserts that the "image decoders for expanding the compressed page data" feature of claim 1 is not adequately described to demonstrate possession. However, referring to Fig. 3a JPEG decoder 28 and a G4FAX decoder 39 are illustrated and correspondingly described in the description at page 9, line 40 to page 10, line 13. Further technical description is found at page 10, line 33 to page 11, line 10 for the G4FAX decoder. References for the JPEG decoder algorithm is provided at page 11, lines 11 – 28. Further discussion of the JPEG decoder is found at page 11, line 35 to page 13, line 8.

It is also highlighted to the Examiner that the level of knowledge and skill in the art of the present invention is relatively high and the person skilled in the art would readily consider that these features were described in sufficient detail so that one skilled in the art would conclude that the inventor had possession of such features.

The Examiner also asserts a perceived lack of possession concerning the claimed feature of "a printhead interface to output the composite strip to a printhead". However, the printhead interface, generally illustrated in Fig. 3 as printhead interface 32, is described in detail from page 23, line 30 to page 29, line 12. At page 24, line 9, the printhead interface (PHI) is explained to contain a LSGU (LineSyncGen) and a MJJ (Memjet Interface). Both the LSGU and MJJ, forming the PHI, are described at an adequate level to permit one skilled in the art to reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of such a feature.

It is also highlighted to the Examiner that the present application incorporates by cross-reference the disclosures of numerous patent applications as detailed on page 1. Particularly, the Applicant's US Patents/Applications 09/575,152; 6,428,133; 6,526,658; 6,328,417; and 6,390,591 describe printheads that can be used with the presently claimed invention. Also, in US Patents/Applications 09/575,108; 09/575,109; 09/575,110; 6,398,332; 6,394,573; and 6,622,923 describe a print engine/controller which further details particular features of the presently claimed invention. These aforementioned applications and patents are incorporated into the present description at page 2 by cross reference.

Appln No. 10/713,091
Amdt. Dated 24 January 2005
Response to Office Action of 16th November 2004

4


It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as a whole, and the dependant claims, are adequately described as each essential feature of claim 1 is adequately described in the specification at a sufficient level to allow one skilled in the art to realise the inventor was in possession of the claimed invention. The Examiner is again respectfully reminded that it has been considered (*In re Wertheim*) that the United States Patent and Trademark Office has the initial burden of presenting evidence why a person skilled in the art would not recognise in the disclosure a description of the invention defined by the claims. In light of the foregoing clarification and discussion it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection has been traversed.

The applicants have amended page 1 of the specification with an updated cross-reference to the related application. The applicants submit that this amendment introduces no new matter.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 USC 112. The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance of all the claims presently under examination.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:


SIMON ROBERT WALMSLEY


PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762